

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, et al. (US 6,212,553) in view of “Sams Teach Yourself Outlook 98 in 24 Hours” by John R. Nicholson, published in 1998. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that Lee teaches all the features of claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 except for the display of an answering state, as claimed. The Office Action alleges that Nicholson provides this teaching absent in Lee. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee teaches an electronic mail system in which a user sends a request and can view whether recipients of the request have responded and in what manner. The user can determine if the recipient has read the emails by a marked indication. Lee’s system does not indicate whether they have answered the email request.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee does not teach or suggest the answering state of the respective communications. Lee’s system is directed to a particular communication type, namely email, and does not have the capability of performing similar tasks from various other communications devices as it does for the email device. Lee’s system essentially only concerns email communications directed to a recipient.

Further, Nicholson teaches an email system that provides an indication of the email message status. However, the system discussed in Nicholson is also directed solely towards

email communications and does not teach or suggest capabilities to perform similar tasks from various other communication types.

In contrast, embodiments of applicants invention, have the capability to provide a display and answer state for a plurality of communication types. This capability extends, for example, to telephone and Internet communications as well as email. Thus, embodiments of the present invention provides the universality necessary to operate with the many communication devices utilized today and provide a user with the necessary answer state from any type of communication device, not just email.

Thus, applicants respectfully submit that Lee in combination with Nicholson's teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an information history list display section capable of displaying communication history from a plurality of different types of communications, in connection with an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications based on history related information which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates the answering state of the respective communications, as recited in claim 1.

Also, the combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a personal information management section for transmitting, in response to a request from an information terminal that is capable of displaying respective communications, from a plurality of different types of communications, which belong to each of the information terminal users, and in connection with an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications based on history related information which is generated by outgoing

or incoming communication, requested information to said information terminal, as recited in claim 9.

The combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an information management table capable of recording history related information from a plurality of different types of communications, which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications stored in said history management section; and an information history list display section for displaying the respective communications in connection with the answering state of the respective communications based on the history related information stored in said information management table, as recited in claim 13.

The teachings of Lee and Nicholson also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, recording communication history of respective communications, from a plurality of different types of communications; recording history related information which is generated by outgoing or incoming communication and indicates an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of the respective communications; and displaying the respective communications in connection with the answering state of the respective communications based on the history related information, as recited in claim 17.

Finally, the combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, at least one information processor capable of maintaining a record of communication history information indicating an answering state, whether answer has been completed or not, of

each item wherein said communication history information being generated from a plurality of different types of communications, as recited in claim 18.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Lee and Nicholson's teachings fail to teach each and every feature of the claims as required. Thus, claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 18 are distinguishable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, 14-16 and 19 are also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant